arXiv:1305.0514v1 [math-ph] 2 May 2013

Pseudo-bosons for the D_2 type quantum Calogero model

F. Bagarello
DEIM, Facoltà di Ingegneria,
Università di Palermo,
I-90128 Palermo, ITALY
e-mail: fabio.bagarello@unipa.it
Home page: www.unipa.it/fabio.bagarello

Abstract

In the first part of this paper we show how a simple system, a 2-dimensional quantum harmonic oscillator, can be described in terms of pseudo-bosonic variables. This apparently *strange* choice is useful when the *natural* Hilbert space of the system, $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ in this case, is, for some reason, not the most appropriate. This is exactly what happens for the D_2 type quantum Calogero model considered in the second part of the paper, where the Hilbert space $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ appears to be an unappropriate choice, since the eigenvectors of the relevant hamiltonian are not square-integrable. Then we discuss how a certain intertwining operator arising from the model can be used to fix a different Hilbert space more *useful*.

I Introduction

In a series of recent papers we have investigated some mathematical and physical aspects of the so-called *pseudo-bosons*, see [1] for a recent review. They arise from the canonical commutation relation $[a, a^\dagger] = 1\!\!1$ upon replacing $a^\dagger$ by another (unbounded) operator b not (in general) related to a: $[a, b] = 1\!\!1$. We have shown that $N = ba$ and $N^\dagger = a^\dagger b^\dagger$ can be both diagonalized, and that their eigenvalues coincide with the set of natural numbers (including 0), $\mathbb{N}_0$. However the sets of related eigenvectors are not orthonormal (o.n.) bases, while they turn out to be automatically *biorthogonal*. In most of the concrete examples considered so far, they are bases of the Hilbert space of the system, $\mathcal{H}$, and, in some cases, they are also *Riesz bases*. In [2] our original framework has been extended in order to include in the treatment also non self-adjoint operators with *more elaborate* spectra, i.e. with eigenvalues not necessarily coincident with the natural numbers, while in [3] we have considered the same problem from an algebraic point of view, constructing, in particular, the partial *-algebra arising from a and b.

In a recent paper, [4], the authors have shown how the D_N type quantum Calogero model can be mapped, via a similarity transformation, into a system of N decoupled quantum harmonic oscillators (QHOs). However, in order to deduce the eigenvectors of the original hamiltonian, a serious problem appears: they do not belong to $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$. For this reason, they propose a possible way out by considering suitable symmetrized wave-functions and showing that these are o.n. with respect to a different scalar product. Similar problems already appeared in older papers, regarding other types of Calogero models (A_{N-1} and B_N, for instance, in [5] and in references therein).

In this paper, we will consider a similar approach, but we justify our proposal by a preliminary analysis of a two-dimensional QHO. This is related to the possibility of being interested to functions, exactly as it happens for the Calogero model, which do not belong to $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ but to some different Hilbert space. Moreover we show that, with this choice, we end up with a simple o.n. basis and that the hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_D$, see Section IV, which is not self-adjoint in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, becomes self-adjoint (at least formally) in the *new* Hilbert space.

This paper is organized as follows: in the next section we briefly review few facts on two-dimensional pseudo-bosons. In Section III we show how they can be used, and why, in the analysis of a two (or more)-dimensional QHO. In Section IV we write the D_2 type quantum Calogero model in terms of pseudo-bosonic operators and we discuss the problems arising and a possible solution. Our conclusions are given in Section V. The appendix contains some technical results.

II The commutation rules

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a given Hilbert space with scalar product $\langle .,. \rangle$ and related norm $\|.\|$. We introduce two pairs of operators, a_j and b_j, $j=1,2$, acting on $\mathcal{H}$ and satisfying the following commutation rules

$$[a_j, b_j] = 1\!\!1, \quad \text{and} \quad [a_1^\sharp, a_2^\sharp] = [a_1^\sharp, b_2^\sharp] = [b_1^\sharp, b_2^\sharp] = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

where $x^\sharp$ stands for x or $x^\dagger$ ($x = a_j, b_j$). Of course, they collapse to the CCR's for independent modes if $b_j = a_j^\dagger$, $j=1,2$. It is well known that a_j and b_j cannot be defined on all of $\mathcal{H}$. Writing $D^\infty(X) := \cap_{p\geq 0} D(X^p)$ (the common domain of all the powers of the operator X), we consider the following:

Assumption 1.– there exists a non-zero $\varphi_{0,0} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $a_j \varphi_{0,0} = 0$, $j=1,2$, and $\varphi_{0,0} \in D^\infty(b_1) \cap D^\infty(b_2)$.

Assumption 2.– there exists a non-zero $\Psi_{0,0} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $b_j^\dagger \Psi_{0,0} = 0$, $j=1,2$, and $\Psi_{0,0} \in D^\infty(a_1^\dagger) \cap D^\infty(a_2^\dagger)$.

Under these assumptions we can introduce the following vectors in $\mathcal{H}$:

$$\varphi_{n,l} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!l!}}\, b_1^n\, b_2^l\, \varphi_{0,0} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_{n,l} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!l!}} (a_1^\dagger)^n (a_2^\dagger)^l \Psi_{0,0}, \quad n,l \geq 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Let us now define the unbounded operators $N_j := b_j a_j$ and $\mathfrak{N}_j := N_j^\dagger = a_j^\dagger b_j^\dagger$, $j=1,2$. It is possible to check that $\varphi_{n,l}$ belongs to the domain of N_j, $D(N_j)$, and that $\Psi_{n,l} \in D(\mathfrak{N}_j)$, for all $n,l \geq 0$ and $j=1,2$. Moreover,

$$N_1 \varphi_{n,l} = n \varphi_{n,l}, \quad N_2 \varphi_{n,l} = l \varphi_{n,l}, \quad \mathfrak{N}_1 \Psi_{n,l} = n \Psi_{n,l}, \quad \mathfrak{N}_2 \Psi_{n,l} = l \Psi_{n,l}. \tag{2.3}$$

Under the above assumptions, and choosing the normalization of $\Psi_{0,0}$ and $\varphi_{0,0}$ in such a way $\langle \Psi_{0,0}, \varphi_{0,0} \rangle = 1$, it is easy to check that

$$\langle \Psi_{n,l}, \varphi_{m,k} \rangle = \delta_{n,m} \delta_{l,k}, \quad \forall n,m,l,k \geq 0. \tag{2.4}$$

This means that the sets $\mathcal{F}_\Psi = \{\Psi_{n,l},\, n,l \geq 0\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\varphi = \{\varphi_{n,l},\, n,l \geq 0\}$ are *biorthogonal* and, therefore, the vectors of each set are linearly independent. However, they are not necessarily complete in $\mathcal{H}$. Hence, this is something to be assumed:

Assumption 3.– $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ are bases of $\mathcal{H}$.

Let us now introduce the operators S_φ and S_Ψ via their action respectively on $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$:

$$S_\varphi \Psi_{n,k} = \varphi_{n,k}, \qquad S_\Psi \varphi_{n,k} = \Psi_{n,k}, \tag{2.5}$$

for all $n, k \geq 0$, which also imply that $\Psi_{n,k} = (S_\Psi\, S_\varphi)\Psi_{n,k}$ and $\varphi_{n,k} = (S_\varphi\, S_\Psi)\varphi_{n,k}$, for all $n, k \geq 0$. Hence, at least if S_φ and S_Ψ are bounded,

$$S_\Psi\, S_\varphi = S_\varphi\, S_\Psi = 1\!\!1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad S_\Psi = S_\varphi^{-1}. \tag{2.6}$$

In other words, both S_Ψ and S_φ are invertible and one is the inverse of the other. Furthermore, we can also check that they are both positive, well defined and symmetric, and they can be written, formally, in the bra-ket notation as

$$S_\varphi = \sum_{n,k=0}^{\infty} |\varphi_{n,k}><\varphi_{n,k}|, \qquad S_\Psi = \sum_{n,k=0}^{\infty} |\Psi_{n,k}><\Psi_{n,k}|. \tag{2.7}$$

These operators are both bounded if and only if $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ are Riesz bases, [6]. In this case the pseudo-bosons have been called *regular*. We conclude this short review by recalling that the following interesting intertwining relations among non self-adjoint operators, are automatically satisfied:

$$S_\Psi\, N_j = \mathfrak{N}_j S_\Psi \quad \text{and} \quad N_j\, S_\varphi = S_\varphi\, \mathfrak{N}_j, \tag{2.8}$$

$j = 1, 2$. These are related to the fact that: (i) N_j and $N_j^\dagger$ have the same eigenvalues; (ii) their eigenvectors are related by S_Ψ and S_φ as in (2.5).

III The QHO

In view of what we will do in the next sections, we consider here a multi-dimensional QHO[1] in terms of pseudo-bosonic operators. Of course, in principle, there is no reason a priori to replace ordinary canonical commutation relations with something like (2.1). However, it may happen, and this is exactly what happens in Section IV, that for some reason we need to act on some particular square integrable functions with unbounded operators which *bring* these functions outside of $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. This suggests that $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ may not be the *right* Hilbert space. For this reason we consider the following question: what does it happen if we consider the two-dimensional QHO in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ which is not necessarily $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$? In particular, we will consider here $\mathcal{H}_\pi = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2, e^{\pi(x_1,x_2)}dx_1\, dx_2)$, where $\pi(x_1, x_2) \leq 0$ almost everywhere (a.e.) is a function still to be fixed. The scalar product in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ is

$$\left\langle f, g\right\rangle_\pi := \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \overline{f(x_1, x_2)}\, g(x_1, x_2)\, e^{\pi(x_1,x_2)} dx_1\, dx_2,$$

---

[1] As a matter of fact, we will only consider a two-dimensional case, since adding dimensions to the system does not change significantly our main results.

for all f, g for which this integral makes sense. For instance, later on we will take $\pi(x_1, x_2) = -\frac{1}{2}\,\omega(x_1^2 + x_2^2)$, for a given positive ω. With this choice, as well as for any other choice of non positive $\pi(x_1, x_2)$, it is clear that $\mathcal{H}_\pi \supset \mathcal{H}$, so that many functions which are not square-integrable, can still be treated as elements of $\mathcal{H}_\pi$. This is the situation we are interested in, here. The price we have to pay, how we will discuss in details, is that the orthonormality of the standard set of eigenvectors of the hamiltonian of the oscillator, h, is lost, as well as its self-adjointness. This is due to the fact that in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ the adjoint, $*$, does not coincide with that of $\mathcal{H}$, $\dagger$. In fact, calling $\langle ., . \rangle$ the scalar product in $\mathcal{H}$, they satisfy different rules:

$$\langle Af, g \rangle = \left\langle f, A^\dagger g \right\rangle, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \langle Af, g \rangle_\pi = \langle f, A^* g \rangle_\pi\,,$$

whenever these quantities are defined. Then, the position and the momentum operators satisfy the following: $x_j^\dagger = x_j = x_j^*$, while $p_j = p_j^\dagger$ but $p_j^* = p_j - i\pi_j(x_1, x_2)$, $j = 1, 2$, where $\pi_j(x_1, x_2) = \frac{\partial \pi(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_j}$. Of course, if, in particular, $\pi(x_1, x_2) = 0$ a.e., then $\mathcal{H}_\pi = \mathcal{H}$ and $\dagger = *$.

The hamiltonian of our QHO is $h = \frac{1}{2}(-\partial_1^2 + \omega^2 x_1^2) + \frac{1}{2}(-\partial_2^2 + \omega^2 x_2^2)$. This hamiltonian is self adjoint in $\mathcal{H}$, $h = h^\dagger$, while it is not self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$, $h \neq h^*$. Introducing, as usual, $a_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\omega x_j + i p_j) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\omega x_j + \partial_j)$ and $b_j = a_j^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\omega x_j - \partial_j) \neq a_j^*$, we can rewrite h, but for an unessential constant, as follows

$$h = \omega \left(a_1^\dagger\, a_1 + a_2^\dagger\, a_2 \right) = \omega \left(b_1\, a_1 + b_2\, a_2 \right),$$

depending on the Hilbert space we want to use for the analysis of the system. In this section we use $h = \omega\,(b_1\, a_1 + b_2\, a_2)$ since, as we have already stressed, we are interested in working in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$.

It is clear that the function $\varphi_{0,0}(x_1, x_2)$ satisfying Assumption 1 of Section II is, except for a normalization, exactly the *standard gaussian*: $\varphi_{0,0}(x_1, x_2) = N_\varphi\, e^{-\frac{1}{2}\omega(x_1^2 + x_2^2)}$. In fact, $a_1\varphi_{0,0}(x_1, x_2) = a_2\varphi_{0,0}(x_1, x_2) = 0$ and $b_1^{n_1} b_2^{n_2} \varphi_{0,0}(x_1, x_2)$ are well defined functions in $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_\pi$ for all $n_1, n_2 \geq 0$. This follows from the fact that $b_j = a_j^\dagger$, so that

$$\varphi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1, x_2) = \frac{N_\varphi}{\sqrt{n_1! n_2! 2^{n_1+n_2}}}\, H_{n_1}(\sqrt{\omega} x_1) H_{n_2}(\sqrt{\omega} x_2) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\omega(x_1^2 + x_2^2)}, \tag{3.1}$$

where H_n is the n-th Hermite polynomial. For all n_1 and n_2 these functions belong to $\mathcal{H}$, so that they also belong to $\mathcal{H}_\pi$.

The set $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ of these functions is a basis in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$: it is clear that the various φ_{n_1,n_2} are linearly independent. We also know that $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ is complete in $\mathcal{H}$, and is actually an o.n. basis for $\mathcal{H}$, for a certain choice of N_φ. In order to check that $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ is complete in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ too, we consider $f \in \mathcal{H}_\pi$

satisfying $\langle f, \varphi_{n_1,n_2}\rangle_\pi = 0$, $\forall\, n_1, n_2$. Now, since $\pi(x_1, x_2) \leq 0$ a.e., $e^{2\pi(x_1,x_2)} \leq e^{\pi(x_1,x_2)}$ a.e., so that $fe^\pi \in \mathcal{H}$. In fact

$$\|f\, e^\pi\|^2 = \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f(x_1, x_2)|^2\, e^{2\pi(x_1,x_2)} dx_1\, dx_2 \leq \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f(x_1, x_2)|^2\, e^{\pi(x_1,x_2)} dx_1\, dx_2 = \|f\|_\pi^2,$$

which is finite since $f \in \mathcal{H}_\pi$. Hence, we can write $0 = \langle f, \varphi_{n_1,n_2}\rangle_\pi = \langle f\, e^\pi, \varphi_{n_1,n_2}\rangle$, $\forall\, n_1, n_2$. The completeness of $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ in $\mathcal{H}$ implies now that $f\, e^\pi = 0$. Therefore $f = 0$.

Just a little bit more complicated is the analysis of Assumption 2, since the role of $\pi(x_1, x_2)$ appears already in the definition of the functions $\psi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1, x_2)$, and not only at the level of the scalar product. Indeed we have

$$b_j^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\omega x_j + \pi_j + \partial_j), \qquad a_j^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\omega x_j - \pi_j - \partial_j).$$

Notice that, not surprisingly, $b_j^* = (a_j^\dagger)^* \neq a_j$. The vacuum of b_j^* can be easily computed: $\Psi_{0,0}(x_1, x_2) = N_\Psi\, e^{-\frac{1}{2}\omega(x_1^2+x_2^2)-\pi(x_1,x_2)}$. A sufficient condition for $\Psi_{0,0}$ to belong to $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ is that $\pi(x_1, x_2) = (\beta-\omega)(x_1^2+x_2^2)$, with $0 < \beta < \omega$. With this choice, for instance, $\|\Psi_{0,0}\|_\pi^2 = |N_\Psi|^2\, \frac{\pi}{\omega}$. Moreover, the action of powers of a_j^* on $\Psi_{0,0}(x_1, x_2)$ produces polynomials times an exponential function, not necessarily decreasing,

$$\Psi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1, x_2) = N_\Psi\, p_{n_1}(x_1) q_{n_2}(x_2) e^{\left(\frac{\omega}{2}-\beta\right)(x_1^2+x_2^2)},$$

which are still in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ for all n_1 and n_2, due to the definition of $\langle ., .\rangle_\pi$. Of course, if $\pi(x_1, x_2) = \pi(x_2, x_1)$, for all n we have $p_n(x) = q_n(x)$, where n is the order of the polynomials. Otherwise these polynomials may be different. Hence, Assumption 2 is satisfied. In Section III.1, with the particular choice of $\beta = \frac{\omega}{2}$, we will give the details of these polynomials. The functions Ψ_{n_1,n_2} are linearly independent, clearly. To check that $\mathcal{F}_\Psi = \{\Psi_{n_1,n_2}\}$ is also complete in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$, we begin noticing that $f \in \mathcal{H}_\pi$ if and only if $f\, e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi} \in \mathcal{H}$: $\|f\|_\pi = \|f\, e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi}\|$. Secondly, if p_n and q_m are polynomials of degree n and m respectively, it is possible to check, [7], that the auxiliary set $\mathcal{F}_p = \{P_{n_1,n_2}(x_1, x_2) := p_{n_1}(x_1) q_{n_2}(x_2) e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}(x_1^2+x_2^2)}, n_j \geq 0\}$, is complete in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all choices of positive β. Therefore, assuming that $\langle f, \Psi_{n_1,n_2}\rangle_\pi = 0$ for all n_1 and n_2, since

$$\langle f, \Psi_{n_1,n_2}\rangle_\pi = \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\overline{f(x_1, x_2)}\, e^{\frac{1}{2}\,\pi(x_1,x_2)}\right)\, P_{n_1,n_2}(x_1, x_2)\, dx_1\, dx_2,$$

we deduce that $f(x_1, x_2)\, e^{\frac{1}{2}\,\pi(x_1,x_2)} = 0$ a.e., so that $f(x_1, x_2) = 0$ a.e., as expected. Hence, both $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ are complete in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$.

III.1 The choice $\pi(x_1,x_2)=-\frac{\omega}{2}(x_1^2+x_2^2)$

Let us now consider what happens if $\beta=\frac{\omega}{2}$ or, in other words, when $\pi(x_1,x_2)=-\frac{\omega}{2}(x_1^2+x_2^2)$. Of course, nothing changes in $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$, since $\pi(x_1,x_2)$ plays no role in the definition of $\varphi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)$. On the other hand, since $a_j^*=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}\,(2\omega\, x_j-\partial_j)$ and $b_j^*=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}\partial_j$, we find

$$\Psi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)=\frac{N_\Psi}{\sqrt{n_1!n_2!2^{n_1+n_2}}}\,H_{n_1}(\sqrt{\omega}\,x_1)H_{n_2}(\sqrt{\omega}\,x_2), \tag{3.2}$$

where $H_n(x)$ is the n-th Hermite polynomial. Incidentally we observe that $\Psi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)\notin\mathcal{H}$, while $\Psi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)\in\mathcal{H}_\pi$. This remark will be our main motivation for changing Hilbert space in the analysis of the D_2 type of the Calogero model in the next section. Fixing the normalization $N_\varphi=N_\Psi=\sqrt{\frac{\omega}{\pi}}$ we get $\langle\varphi_{n_1,n_2},\Psi_{m_1,m_2}\rangle_\pi=\delta_{n_1,m_1}\delta_{n_2,m_2}$: the two sets are biorthogonal. They are more than this: they are bases. The proof of this statement is given in the Appendix.

Using now the summation formula $\sum_{k=0}^\infty\frac{1}{2^kk!}\,H_k(x)\,H_k(y)=\sqrt{\pi}\,e^{\frac{1}{2}(x^2+y^2)}\delta(x-y)$, we deduce the following forms for the intertwining operators S_φ and S_Ψ:

$$\left(S_\Psi f\right)(x_1,x_2):=\sum_{n_1,n_2=0}^\infty\langle\Psi_{n_1,n_2},f\rangle_\pi\,\Psi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)=e^{\frac{1}{2}\,\omega\,(x_1^2+x_2^2)}\,f(x_1,x_2),$$

while

$$\left(S_\varphi f\right)(x_1,x_2):=\sum_{n_1,n_2=0}^\infty\langle\varphi_{n_1,n_2},f\rangle_\pi\,\varphi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)=e^{-\frac{1}{2}\,\omega\,(x_1^2+x_2^2)}\,f(x_1,x_2),$$

so that they are multiplication operators and $S_\varphi=S_\Psi^{-1}$, as expected. The operator S_Ψ is unbounded on $\mathcal{H}_\pi$, while S_φ turns out to be bounded. Hence, see [1], our pseudo-bosons are non-regular and, consequently, $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ are not Riesz bases.

Going back to the general situation, we have $h\varphi_{n_1,n_2}=\omega(n_1+n_2)\varphi_{n_1,n_2}$ and $h^*\Psi_{n_1,n_2}=\omega(n_1+n_2)\Psi_{n_1,n_2}$, as well as $S_\Psi\,h=h^*S_\Psi$. Needless to say, all that we have found here can be trivially extended to higher dimensions.

The lesson we learn is the following: if $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is not *big enough* to deal with a particular quantum system, we could always try to introduce some weight in the Hilbert space (i.e. to change the scalar product) in order to *enlarge* it. The price to pay, which is not an high price, is that the orthogonal set of eigenstates of a certain self-adjoint operator $h=h^\dagger$ must be doubled, producing two sets of biorthogonal bases, which turn out to be eigenvectors of h and of the new adjoint of, h, h^*, respectively. These two sets are further mapped one into the other by a certain intertwining operator and by its inverse. Stated in different words: the use of pseudo-hermitian operators, [8, 9], could be related to the necessity of enlarge the Hilbert space where the physical system needs to be described.

IV The Calogero model in pseudo-bosonic variables

We will now consider the D_2 type Calogero model as described in [4]. In particular, their preliminary analysis will play a crucial role in our treatment. For this reason, their approach will be quickly reviewed.

The starting point is the following self-adjoint (in $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$) hamiltonian

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{2}\left(-\partial_j^2 + \omega^2 x_j^2\right) + \nu(\nu-1)\left[\frac{1}{(x_1-x_2)^2} + \frac{1}{(x_1+x_2)^2}\right],$$

where $\nu > \frac{1}{2}$, which, putting $\Psi_0(x_1,x_2) = |x_1^2 - x_2^2|^\nu \, e^{-\frac{1}{2}\omega(x_1^2+x_2^2)}$ and $E_0 = \omega(1+2\nu)$, produces

$$\tilde{H}_D := \Psi_0^{-1}(H_D - E_0)\Psi_0 = \omega O_E - \frac{1}{2}\, O_L, \tag{4.1}$$

where we have introduced the operators $O_E = x_1\partial_1 + x_2\partial_2$, $\nabla^2 = \partial_1^2 + \partial_2$, $X^2 = x_1^2 + x_2^2$ and $O_L = \nabla^2 + 4\nu\,\frac{1}{x_1^2 - x_2^2}\,(x_1\partial_1 - x_2\partial_2)$. They satisfy the following commutation relations

$$[O_L, O_E] = 2O_L, \quad [O_E, X^2] = 2X^2, \quad [\nabla^2, O_E] = 2\nabla^2, \quad [\nabla^2, X^2] = 4(O_E + 1\!\!1). \tag{4.2}$$

Let us now put $a_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}\,(\omega x_j + i p_j)$, $a_j^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}\,(\omega x_j - i p_j)$, $j = 1, 2$, and let us introduce, at least formally, the operator

$$T = e^{-\frac{1}{4\omega}O_L}\, e^{\frac{1}{4\omega}\nabla^2}\, e^{\frac{1}{2}\omega X^2}. \tag{4.3}$$

Here $a_j^\dagger$ is the adjoint of a_j in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. The operator T is invertible and we find

$$T^{-1}\tilde{H}_D T = \omega\hat{N} =: h, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\hat{N} = \hat{n}_1 + \hat{n}_2 = a_1^\dagger a_1 + a_2^\dagger a_2$, [4]. It is interesting to notice that, while H_D and h are self-adjoint, the intermediate hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_D$ is not. In particular we can check that

$$\tilde{H}_D^\dagger = -\tilde{H}_D - \nabla^2 - 4\nu\frac{x_1^2 + x_2^2}{(x_1^2 - x_2^2)^2} - 2\omega 1\!\!1.$$

This is related first to the fact that the map from H_D to $\tilde{H}_D$, implemented by Ψ_0, is not unitary. Also, $T^\dagger \neq T^{-1}$: T is a similarity but not an unitary map. Hence, as already discussed in [4], domain problems arise, since T and T^{-1} are unbounded.

Remark:– A similar procedure works also for larger values of N, [4]. In fact, introducing

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(-\partial_j^2 + \omega^2 x_j^2\right) + \nu(\nu-1)\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq N}\left[\frac{1}{(x_i-x_j)^2} + \frac{1}{(x_i+x_j)^2}\right],$$

$$\Psi_0(x_1,x_2) = \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq N}|x_i^2 - x_j^2|^\nu\, e^{-\frac{1}{2}\omega\sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2}, \quad E_0 = \frac{1}{2}N\omega + \nu N(N-1)\omega,$$

and

$$O_E = \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i\partial_i, \quad O_L = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\partial_i^2 + 4\nu\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq N}\frac{1}{x_i^2 - x_j^2}\left(x_i\partial_i - x_j\partial_j\right),$$

we could repeat, with minor differences, the same steps as for $N = 2$, mapping (non unitarily) H_D into a self-adjoint hamiltonian describing N uncoupled operators.

IV.1 A formal point of view in $\mathcal{H}$

Let us introduce two pairs of operators $A_j := Ta_jT^{-1}$ and $B_j = Ta_j^\dagger T^{-1}$, $j = 1,2$. It is clear that $[A_j, B_k] = \delta_{j,k}1\!\!1$, $A_j^\dagger \neq B_j$. Hence they are pseudo-bosonic operators, not everywhere defined. Moreover, it is possible to show that, introducing the invertible but, again, not unitary operator $\Omega := e^{-\frac{1}{4\omega}O_L}$, these operators take the following, simpler, forms:

$$A_j = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2\omega}}\,\Omega\, p_j\,\Omega^{-1}, \qquad B_j = \sqrt{2\omega}\,\Omega\, x_j\,\Omega^{-1}. \tag{4.5}$$

These formulas show that the pseudo-bosonic operators are (at least, formally) similar to the original position and momentum operators. The hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_D$ can be written now as

$$\tilde{H}_D = \omega(B_1A_1 + B_2A_2). \tag{4.6}$$

The eigenstates of $\tilde{H}_D$ can be formally constructed quite easily: let $\varphi_{0,0}$ be a non zero vector satisfying $A_j\varphi_{0,0} = 0$, $j = 1,2$, and let us define the vectors $\varphi_{n_1,n_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1!\,n_2!}}\,B_1^{n_1}\,B_2^{n_2}\varphi_{0,0}$, as in Section II. For the time being, we assume that all these vectors are well defined in $\mathcal{H}$. We will return on this aspect in a moment. Then we have $\tilde{H}_D\varphi_{n_1,n_2} = \epsilon_{n_1,n_2}\varphi_{n_1,n_2}$, where $\epsilon_{n_1,n_2} = \omega(n_1+n_2)$. Going on with our formal computations, it is quite easy to find the eigenstates of $\tilde{H}_D^\dagger = \omega(A_1^\dagger\,B_1^\dagger + A_2^\dagger\,B_2^\dagger)$. For that it is enough to consider a second *ground state* $\Psi_{0,0}$, satisfying $B_j^\dagger\Psi_{0,0} = 0$, $j = 1,2$, and to define the vectors $\Psi_{n_1,n_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1!\,n_2!}}\,(A_1^\dagger)^{n_1}\,(A_2^\dagger)^{n_2}\Psi_{0,0}$. Then $\tilde{H}_D^\dagger\Psi_{n_1,n_2} = \epsilon_{n_1,n_2}\Psi_{n_1,n_2}$, and the φ_{n_1,n_2}'s and Ψ_{n_1,n_2}'s are expected to be mutually orthogonal. Continuing our formal approach, we could further expect that $\mathcal{F}_\varphi = \{\varphi_{n_1,n_2}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\Psi = \{\Psi_{n_1,n_2}\}$

are bases of $\mathcal{H}$, but not necessarily Riesz bases. $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ could be further used to define two intertwining operators, as discussed in Section II.

However, the situation is not so simple, as already stressed in [4]. For this reason, we devote the next section to an alternative approach to the system.

IV.2 Back to non-formal computations

Let us consider the hamiltonian h introduced in (4.4). This is the hamiltonian of a two-dimensional quantum oscillator, and its eigenstates are easily found: these can be written as $\Phi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1!\,n_2!}}\,(a_1^\dagger)^{n_1}\,(a_2^\dagger)^{n_2}\Phi_{0,0}(x_1,x_2)$, where $a_j\Phi_{0,0}(x_1,x_2)=0$, $j=1,2$. Then

$$h\,\Phi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)=\epsilon_{n_1,n_2}\Phi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2).$$

Explicitly we have

$$\Phi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1!n_2!2^{n_1+n_2}}}\left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{1/2}H_{n_1}(\sqrt{\omega}\,x_1)H_{n_2}(\sqrt{\omega}\,x_2)\,e^{-\frac{1}{2}\,\omega(x_1^2+x_2^2)},$$

where, as usual, H_n is the n-th Hermite polynomial. It is now easy to write the functions in $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ is a rather compact form:

$$\varphi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)=T\Phi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)=\left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{1/2}\sqrt{\frac{(2\omega)^{n_1+n_2}}{n_1!n_2!}}\,\Omega\,x_1^{n_1}\,x_2^{n_2}, \tag{4.7}$$

which reduces, for instance, to $\varphi_{0,0}(x_1,x_2)=\left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{1/2}$, for $n_1=n_2=0$. This already shows that, contrarily to what assumed previously and in agreement with the results in [4, 5] and references therein, $\varphi_{0,0}(x_1,x_2)$ does not belong to $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. It is natural to expect that, also for other values of n_1 and n_2, $\varphi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)\notin\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Moreover, moving from formal to explicit computations, is even more difficult to deduce the analytic form of the functions $\Psi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)$, and to check whether they belong or not to $\mathcal{H}$. However, in Section III we have shown in some details that leaving $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is not a major disaster, and can produce interesting consequences. This is, in fact, our point of view now, and we ask the following question: instead of working in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, does it exist some different Hilbert space which can be used to deal with $\tilde{H}_D$ and with its eigenvectors? The answer is affirmative: the right Hilbert space is $\mathcal{H}_T:=D(T^{-1})$, the domain of the operator T^{-1}, endowed with the scalar product $\langle f,g\rangle_T:=\langle T^{-1},T^{-1}g\rangle$, $f,g\in\mathcal{H}_T$[2]. It is clear that $\varphi_{n_1,n_2} \in \mathcal{H}_T$, $\forall\, n_1, n_2$. More than this, the set $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ is o.n.:

---

[2] To be more rigorous, T^{-1} should be a closed operator or, at least, closable. In this case, in fact, we could use its closed extension to define the Hilbert space.

$$\langle \varphi_{n_1,n_2}, \varphi_{m_1,m_2} \rangle_T = \left\langle T^{-1}(T\Phi_{n_1,n_2}), T^{-1}(T\Phi_{m_1,m_2}) \right\rangle = \langle \Phi_{n_1,n_2}, \Phi_{m_1,m_2} \rangle = \delta_{n_1,m_1}\delta_{n_2,m_2}.$$

Of course, this implies that the set $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ coincides with $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ itself. This can be seen as a consequence of the uniqueness of the biorthogonal basis for a given basis in a certain Hilbert space. The fact that $\varphi_{n_1,n_2} = \Psi_{n_1,n_2}$ for all n_1, n_2 may, at a first sight, appear strange, since $\tilde{H}_D \neq \tilde{H}_D^\dagger$. However, this is not so since $\tilde{H}_D$ turns out to be self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_T$. In fact, because of (4.4),

$$\left\langle \tilde{H}_D f, g \right\rangle_T = \left\langle T^{-1}\tilde{H}_D f, T^{-1}g \right\rangle = \left\langle h\, T^{-1} f, T^{-1}g \right\rangle = \left\langle T^{-1} f, h\, T^{-1}g \right\rangle =$$

$$= \left\langle T^{-1} f, T^{-1}\, \tilde{H}_D\, g \right\rangle = \left\langle f, \tilde{H}_D\, g \right\rangle_T,$$

for all $f, g \in D(\tilde{H}_D)$. In a certain sense, this could be considered as a driving idea: whenever a non selfadjoint hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ is similar to a self adjoint operator h, or when a (closed and injective) intertwining operator X relating $\hat{H}$ and h does exist, $X\, \hat{H} = h\, X$, the *natural* Hilbert space where $\hat{H}$ *lives* is not $\mathcal{H}$ with its own scalar product, but rather than that $\mathcal{H}_X := D(X)$ with a scalar product $\langle f, g \rangle_X := \langle Xf, Xg \rangle$, since in this space $\hat{H}$ turns out to be self-adjoint.

Remarks:– (1) In [4], the reason why a procedure of symmetrization was used, was to cancel certain poles in some relevant wave-functions. Changing scalar product may produce the same effect: for instance, if $\hat{x}$ is a pole of the third order for a wave function $\Psi(x)$ of our (one-dimensional) system, it is sufficient to modify the scalar product with a measure containing $(x-\hat{x})^6\, e^{-x^2}$, for instance. In this case, in fact, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\Psi(x)|^2\, (x-\hat{x})^6\, e^{-x^2}\, dx$ can be finite.

(2) There exists a simple situation in which it is possible to check that the choice above of $\mathcal{H}_T$ is, in a certain sense, *optimal*: let T be unbounded with bounded T^{-1}. Of course, this does not appear to be the case for the Calogero model but may be true for other physical systems. Let us consider a different Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}_\alpha$, with scalar product $\langle f, g \rangle_\alpha := \langle T^\alpha f, T^\alpha g \rangle$, $f, g \in D(T^\alpha)$. Because of (4.4), the eigenvectors of $\tilde{H}_D$ are necessarily of the form $T\Phi_{n_1,n_2}$, which belongs to $\mathcal{H}_\alpha$ if $\alpha \leq -1$. Due to the uniqueness of the set $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$, we must have $\Psi_{n_1,n_2} = T^{-(1+2\alpha)}\Phi_{n_1,n_2}$ and $\Psi_{n_1,n_2} \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$ if $\alpha \geq -1$. In fact, with this choice, $\langle \Psi_{n_1,n_2}, \varphi_{m_1,m_2} \rangle_\alpha = \delta_{n_1,m_1}\delta_{n_2,m_2}$. Hence, the only choice which allows $\varphi_{n_1,n_2}, \Psi_{n_1,n_2} \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$, is $\alpha = -1$: we recover our Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_T$.

V Conclusions

We have shown how the QHO could be treated in a weighted $\mathcal{L}^2$ space and how this choice produces an interesting functional structure, where self-adjoint operators are replaced by pseudo-hermitian operators and where o.n. bases are replaced by biorthogonal sets. This procedure can be interesting to *enlarge* the Hilbert space, so to include more functions, not necessarily asymptotically decaying, into the game.

Using the D_2 type Calogero model we have also shown how the choice of the Hilbert space is suggested by the hamiltonian of the system, and from possible existing intertwining operators between this hamiltonian and some related self-adjoint operator. In particular, we have used this idea to deduce a convenient Hilbert space to be used in the analysis of this model. This conclusion reflects very much those of our older analysis concerning the quantum dynamics of quantum systems at an algebraic level, [10], where we have shown how the hamiltonian of a system determines, by itself, the algebraic and the topological settings to be used for the analysis of the system.

Of course, it would be interesting to deduce the explicit form of $D(T^{-1})$ and to prove if T^{-1} is closable. From this point of view, therefore, the results of Section IV.2 require some extra *mathematical* effort. This is work in progress.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Prof. Ragnisco and Dr. Rigoni for useful discussions at a first stage of this paper. I also acknowledge financial support from MIUR.

Appendix: Back to the QHO: $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ are bases for $\mathcal{H}_\pi$

We have already seen that $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ are biorthogonal and complete in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$. However, this does not automatically implies that they are also bases for $\mathcal{H}_\pi$, [11, 12], since there could exist vectors in $\mathcal{H}_\pi$ which cannot be expanded in terms of the vectors of these sets. However, this is not the case in our model. In fact, let us define a new set $\mathcal{E}$ of functions $e_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2) := e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi(x_1,x_2)}\varphi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)$, with $\varphi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)$ as in (3.1). It is easy to check that $\mathcal{E}$ is an o.n. basis for $\mathcal{H}_\pi$. It is also clear that each e_{n_1,n_2} belongs to the domain of T and T^{-1}, $e_{n_1,n_2} \in D(T) \cap D(T^{-1})$. Here T is the following multiplication operator: $(Tf)(x_1,x_2) := e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi(x_1,x_2)}f(x_1,x_2)$, for each $f \in D(T)$. Hence, since $Te_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2) = \varphi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)$ and, for the choice of $\pi(x_1,x_2)$ considered in Section III.1, $T^{-1}e_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2) = \Psi_{n_1,n_2}(x_1,x_2)$, with Ψ_{n_1,n_2} given in (3.2), from [12] follows our claim: $\mathcal{F}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ are bases for $\mathcal{H}_\pi$.

References

[1] F. Bagarello, *Pseudo-bosons, so far*, Rep. Math. Phys., **68**, No. 2, 175-210 (2011)

[2] F. Bagarello, *Non linear pseudo-bosons*, J. Math. Phys., **52**, 063521, (2011)

[3] F. Bagarello, A. Inoue, C.Trapani, *Weak commutation relations of unbounded operators and applications*, J. Math. Phys. **52**, 113508 (2011)

[4] P. Banerjee and B. Basu-Mallick, *Exact solution of D_N type quantum Calogero model through a mapping to free harmonic oscillator*, J. Math. Phys., **52**, 052106 (2011)

[5] A. Nishino, H. Ujino and M. Wadati, *Symmetric Fock space and orthogonal symmetric polynomials associated with the Calogero model*, Chaos, Solitons & Fractals DOI:10.1016/S0960-0779(98)00138-6

[6] F. Bagarello *Pseudo-bosons, Riesz bases and coherent states*, J. Math. Phys., **50**, DOI:10.1063/1.3300804, 023531 (2010) (10pg)

[7] A. Kolmogorov and S. Fomine, *Eléments de la théorie des fonctions et de l'analyse fonctionelle*, Mir (1973)

[8] A. Mostafazadeh, *Pseudo-Hermitian representation of Quantum Mechanics*, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. **7**, 1191-1306 (2010)

[9] C. Bender, *Making Sense of Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians*, Rep. Progr. Phys., **70**, 947-1018 (2007)

[10] F. Bagarello *Algebras of unbounded operators and physical applications: a survey*, Reviews in Math. Phys, **19**, No. 3, 231-272 (2007)

[11] C. Heil, *A basis theory primer: expanded edition*, Springer, New York, (2010)

[12] F. Bagarello, *More mathematics for pseudo-bosons*, Ann. of Phys., submitted.